

Remarks

The present application has claims 1, 4-7, 15-18, 21, 23-24, 29-30, 36-37, 40-42, 46, and 49-59, of which claims 7, 15, 21, 30, 36, 37, 46, and 49 are withdrawn.

Examiner Interview

An Examiner Interview was held on August 22, 2008 between Examiner Robertson and representative for the Applicants, Xiang Lu.

During the interview, the proposed claim amendment was discussed. Examiner Robertson indicated that he will advance the examination of the amended claims in view of Kimball. The rejections under 35 USC §101 were discussed. Examiner Robertson further indicated that he may request further restriction/election of the claims, and rejoin other claims as a result of the proposed amendment. The inclusion of the two “predefined set” in the claims may overcome the prior art of record.

Claim Amendment

In this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 6-7, 15-18, 21, 23-24, 29-30, 36-37, and 40-41 and cancelled claims 2-3, 8-14, 19-20, 25-28, 31-35, 38, 43, 45, and 47 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 2-3, 8-14, 19-20, 25-28, 31-35, 38, 43, 45, and 47, prior to this amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 15-18, 21, 23-24, 29-30, 36-37, and 40-41 were amended and claims 2-3, 8-14, 19-20, 25-28, 31-35, 38, 43, 45, and 47 were cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 2-3, 8-14, 19-20, 25-28, 31-35, 38, 43, 45, and 47, as presented prior to this amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

Applicants have added claims 50-59.

No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendment.

Support for amendment to claim 1 may be found, for example,

“a predefined set”: at page 16, line 19; page 48, line 10 to page 50 line 27, Figures 11 to 16 with predefined dimensions 320-360, and the description thereof;

“shared”: at page 28, lines 8 and 9; and page 43, line 6;

“common”: at page 28, lines 5 and 11; and page 29, line 7 *et seq.*;

“business reference aspects”: at page 8, line 31, and page 29, line 11;

“a subset of shared common dimensions representing a second subset of the business reference aspects of a particular organization in the plurality of organizations”: at page 25, lines 16-27, Figures 13-15 and claim 2 as originally filed;

“a second predefined set of measures representing measurements of business activity aspects of the plurality of organizations”: at page 50, line 29 to page 65, line 10 describing the data structures of 1722-1724, 1728-1731, 1725-1727, 1732-1735, 1713-1721, 1707-1712 as illustrated in Figures 16, and 17A-17AE, and in claim 2 as originally filed;

“the second predefined set of measures grouped into areas of analysis to answer business questions applicable to the plurality of organizations”: at page 8, lines 16-17;

“a third subset of the areas of analysis used to analyze the particular organization”: at page 25, lines 15-27, Figures 13-15 and claim 3 as originally filed;

“a data model implementing the business model”: at page 27, line 12;

“the data model including fact tables and dimension tables, the dimension tables corresponding to the predefined set of shared common dimensions of the business model”: at page 27, lines 12-13;

“a computer readable memory storing the business model and the data model”: at page 69, line 27.

Support for amendment to claim 23 may be found, for example,

“method of building a data warehouse”: for example, at page 2, lines 16 and 20;

“selecting a market; identifying a particular organization in the market; analyzing the particular organization to collect organizational information; determining business questions based on the collected organizational information; merging the business questions into a subset of areas of analysis of a business model applicable to the particular organization; decomposing the subset of areas of analysis into dimensions and measures”: at page 44, lines 18-25;

“the dimensions representing business reference aspects of the particular organization”: at page 8, line 31, and page 29, line 11;

“the measures representing measurements of business activity aspects of the particular organization”: in claim 2 as originally filed;

“providing a predefined set of shared common dimensions representing business reference aspects of a plurality of organizations, the plurality of organizations including the particular organization”: at page 8, line 31; page 16, line 19; page 28, lines 5, 8 – 9, 11; page 29, lines 7 – 11 *et seq.*; page 43, line 6; page 48, line 10 to page 50 line 27, Figures 11 to 16 with predefined dimensions 320-360, and the description thereof;

“providing a second predefined set of measures representing measurements of business activity aspects of the plurality of organizations”: at page 50, line 29 to page 65, line describing the data structures of 1722-1724, 1728-1731, 1725-1727, 1732-1735, 1713-1721, 1707-1712 as illustrated in Figures 16, and 17A-17AE and in claim 2 as originally filed;

“the second predefined set of measures grouped into areas of analysis including the subset of areas of analysis merged from the business questions of the particular organization”: at page 25, lines 15-27, Figures 13-15 and claim 3 as originally filed;

“providing a data model implementing the business model”: at page 27, line 12;

“the data model including fact tables and dimension tables, the dimension tables corresponding to the dimensions of the business model”: at page 27, lines 12-13.

Support for amendment to claim 50 may be found, for example, at page 20, line 4.

Support for amendment to claim 51 may be found, for example, in Figure 11 where dimension 320 is used by areas of analysis in functional areas 402-404.

Support for claim 52 may be found, for example, at page 27, line 18.

Support for claim 53 may be found, for example, at page 16, line 8.

Support for claim 54 may be found, for example, page 21, lines 9-12, and Figure 11.

Support for claim 55 may be found, for example, at page 24, line 17.

Support for claim 56 may be found, for example, at page 8, line 24.

Support for claim 57 may be found, for example, at page 8, lines 25-26.

Support for claim 58 may be found, for example, at page 20, line 7.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §112

The Office rejected claims 1-6, 15-18, 21, 41 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, and 21 to include the limitation “a computer readable memory storing ...”. Claim 41 has been amended by deleting the term “product” in the preamble, and now includes the data structures “business model” and “data model”, and a configuration unit “setting the settable holder”.

Removal of the Office’s rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §101

In the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 18 and 23-29 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being not tied to any statutory class of invention or transform subject matter to a different state or thing.

Independent claim 18 has been amended to recite “executed in a computer processor”. Claim 18 is now tied to an apparatus, and therefore directed to a statutory subject matter.

Independent claim 23 has been amended to include the step “building the data warehouse using the data model” which positively recites the data warehouse being built.

In the Office Action, the Office rejected claims 1-6, 15-17, 21, 40, 41, 43 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claims 1, 21 have been amended to recite “a computer readable memory storing ...”. Therefore, these claims and their dependent claims are now tied to an apparatus, and therefore directed to a statutory subject matter.

Claim 40 is directed to a computer-readable medium, and claim 41 is directed to a computer product on a computer readable medium, respectively. Claim 40 now recites “building the data warehouse”, and claim 41 now recites “a configuration unit configuring the data model”.

Therefore, the final results achieved by the claimed invention are specific, substantial and credible. The results are not abstract. The results are repeatable and predictable. In other words, the results are useful, tangible, and concrete. See (MPEP 2106 IV (C) (2.)(2) a) – c)).

Furthermore, “functional descriptive material” consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (See MPEP 2106.01, first paragraph).

When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. (See MPEP 2106.01, second paragraph).

In addition, the claimed business model and data model includes data structures. A claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure’s functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. (See MPEP 2106.01 (I))

Removal of the Office’s rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101, is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C §103

The Office rejected claims 1-6, 15-18, 23-29, 40, 41, 43 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weissman et al., (US PatentNo. 6,212,524), hereinafter referred as Weissman and in view of Garrett et al., (PCT Publication No. 00/42553), hereinafter referred as Harmony.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection in view of the amendments made herein and the following comments.

The claimed embodiment is directed to a data warehouse system with a business model and a data model. The business model includes a predefined set of shared common

dimensions representing business reference aspects of a plurality of organizations. A subset of the predefined set of dimensions represents the business reference aspects of a particular organization among the plurality of organizations. A predefined set of measures represents measurements of business activity aspects of the plurality of organizations. The predefined set of measures is grouped into areas of analysis to answer business questions applicable to the plurality of organizations. A subset of the areas of analysis is used to analyze the particular organization.

The data model with fact tables and dimension tables implements the business model. The dimension tables correspond to the predefined set of shared common dimensions of the business model and the fact tables include the second predefined set of measures.

Claims 23, 40 and 41 are directed to a method, a computer-readable medium and a computer program and generally parallel claim 1.

Weissman teaches accessing a description of a schema, which schema defines the relationships between the tables and columns. The description therefore defines the semantic meaning of the data. The description is also used to create a set of commands to create the tables.

Harmony is directed to a method for processing business information from multiple enterprises is provided. A data warehouse is populated with business information received from enterprises. The business information is associated with the enterprises based upon a set of standardized categories used in the data warehouse. Information describing the organization of business information in the data warehouse is used to develop rules for extracting a portion of the business information from the data warehouse.

None of Weisman and Harmony teaches or suggests the presently claimed embodiment of a business model having predefined set of shared, common dimensions is provided and a subset of the shared, common dimensions is used for an organization, and a plurality of areas of analysis is provided, and a subset of the areas of analysis is also used.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In view of the above amendments and remarks and having addressed all the objections raised by the Office, reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/John Harris/
John D. Harris
Registration No. 39,465

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP
160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1P 1C3
(613) 233-1781